

PATENT

Serial No. 10/522,286

Amendment in Reply to Final Office Action of December 19, 2008

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed December 19, 2008, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Entry of the present amendment and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-12 and 14 remain in this application, where claims 5, 8-10 and 13 had been previously canceled without prejudice. Claims 1 and 11 are independent.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed. However, to advance prosecution, claims 1 and 11 have been amended for better clarity. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-12 and 14 has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 3, 11-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 4,343,086 (de Vries). It should be noted that page 3 of the Final Office Action

incorrectly refers to de Vries as US 4,343,068 (rather than 4,343,086), where US 4,343,068 is to Holly and is not of record. Further, claims 2, 4 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over de Vries in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,472,853 (Lorenz). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-12 and 14 are patentable over de Vries and Lorenz for at least the following reasons.

de Vries is directed to a shaving apparatus that has hook-shaped projections 58 that point away from the center of a coupling member 37, and hook into recesses 41 in an inner periphery of a central body 38 that has an opening 40, as shown in FIG 4.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 11, amongst other patentable elements recites (illustrative emphasis provided) :

snaps hooks are provided for fastening the coupling member to the inner cutter, wherein the snap hooks have hook portions pointed toward a center of the coupling member and hook onto a coupling bush located around a center of the inner cutter, the coupling bush extending away from a carrier for the cutting elements.

Snaps hooks with hook portions that are pointed toward the center of the coupling member and hook onto a coupling bush that extends away from the carrier for the cutting elements are nowhere disclosed or suggested in de Vries. Rather, de Vries discloses hook-shaped projections 58 that point away from the center of the coupling member 37. Thus, de Vries teaches away from the having hooks that point toward the center of the coupling member as recited in independent claims 1 and 11.

Further, de Vries does not disclose or suggest that the hook portions hook onto a coupling bush extending away from a carrier for the cutting elements, as recited in independent claim 1 and 11. Instead of such a coupling bush, as clearly shown in FIG 4 of de Vries, the central body 38 that includes the cutter 39 has an opening 40 and three recesses 41 in its inner periphery, where the hooks 58 snap into. Lorenz cited to allegedly show other features and does not remedy the deficiencies in Vries.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1 and 11 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-4, 6-7, 12 and 14 should also be allowed at

PATENT

Serial No. 10/522,286

Amendment in Reply to Final Office Action of December 19, 2008

least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 11, as well as their individually patentable elements.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By Dicran Halajian
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
October 15, 2008

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101